



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant submitted an appeal brief 11-12-2009. The examiner discussed with SPEs Vo and Suhol that he believed the most relevant part of the specification (2003/0171149 A1) was Paras. 30 & 31 discussing enhanced and basic audiovisual features, depending on whether the wageror is located at or remotely from the casino. Atty. Justin Swindells discussed the possibility of putting dep. clm. 79 and corresponding limitations into the independent claims, and later e-mailed proposed amendments to this effect with authorization to enter them by examiner's amendment. The examiner subsequently called Mr. Swindells on 01-21-2010 to change the dependencies of claims 25, 26, 28 and 29 to depend from claim 10, as claims 24 and 27 had been cancelled by the proposed amendment. The claims are entered as submitted by the applicant except for the corrections to the dependencies of 25, 26, 28, and 29..